



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 9, 2017

Ms. Laura Anne Coats  
Assistant District Attorney  
Dallas County  
133 North Riverfront Boulevard, LB-19  
Dallas, Texas 75207-4399

OR2017-12699

Dear Ms. Johnson:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 661606.

The Dallas County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") received a request for all policies and training materials from a specified time period pertaining to two specified topics.<sup>1</sup> You state the district attorney's office will release some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup>You state the district attorney's office sought and received clarification of the information requested. See Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); see also *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

(a) Except as provided by Section 261.203, the following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act], and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

- (1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and
- (2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). You assert portions of the submitted information are subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. Upon review, however, we find the submitted information consists of internal training materials. Accordingly, you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue is a report of child abuse or neglect, or was used or developed in an investigation under chapter 261. *See id.* § 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of Family Code ch. 261). Therefore, we conclude section 261.201 is not applicable to any of the submitted information, and none of it may be withheld on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the confidentiality provisions found in chapter 55 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Articles 55.01 through 55.05 of the Code of Criminal Procedure provide for the expunction of criminal records in certain limited circumstances. Article 55.03 prescribes the effect of an expunction order and provides:

When the order of expunction is final:

- (1) the release, maintenance, dissemination, or use of the expunged records and files for any purpose is prohibited;
- (2) except as provided in Subdivision (3) of this article, the person arrested may deny the occurrence of the arrest and the existence of the expunction order; and
- (3) the person arrested or any other person, when questioned under oath in a criminal proceeding about an arrest for which the records have been expunged, may state only that the matter in question has been expunged.

Crim. Proc. Code art. 55.03. Article 55.04 imposes sanctions for violations of an expunction order and provides, in part:

Sec. 1. A person who acquires knowledge of an arrest while an officer or employee of the state or of any agency or other entity of the state or any political subdivision of the state and who knows of an order expunging the records and files relating to that arrest commits an offense if he knowingly releases, disseminates, or otherwise uses the records or files.

*Id.* art. 55.04, § 1. This office has determined records subject to an expunction order are not subject to public disclosure under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 457 at 2 (1987) (governmental body prohibited from releasing or disseminating arrest records subject to expunction order, as “those records are not subject to public disclosure under the [Act]”). You state portions of the submitted information are the subject of expunction orders. However, the district attorney’s office has not submitted copies of the signed expunction orders pertaining to any of the information at issue. We nevertheless conclude to the extent any of the information at issue is the subject of a signed expunction order, the district attorney’s office must withhold any such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with article 55.03 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. To the extent the information at issue is not the subject of a signed expunction order, the information may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). This office has also found common-law privacy generally protects the identifying information of juvenile victims of abuse or neglect. *See* Open Records Decision No. 394 (1983); *cf.* Fam. Code § 261.201. Further, this office has also concluded information that identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offenses must be withheld under common-law privacy. Open Records Decision No. 393 at 2 (1983). The court of appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). We note, however, privacy is a personal right that lapses at death. Thus, information pertaining solely to a deceased individual may not be withheld under common-law privacy. *See Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref’d n.r.e.); *see also Justice v. Belo Broadcasting Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 145, 147 (N.D. Tex. 1979) (“action for invasion of privacy can be maintained only by a living individual whose privacy is invaded” (quoting RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS § 6521)); Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984) (“the right of

privacy lapses upon death”), H-917 (1976) (“We are . . . of the opinion that the Texas courts would follow the almost uniform rule of other jurisdictions that the right of privacy lapses upon death.”); Open Records Decision No. 272 at 1 (1981) (privacy rights lapse upon death).

Upon review, we conclude some of the submitted information meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. We note some this information pertains to sexual assault cases and it appears some of the victims may be identified by a pseudonym. To the extent the victims at issue are identified only by a pseudonym, the victims’ privacy is sufficiently protected, and the district attorney’s office may not withhold the pseudonyms of the victims under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy. Furthermore, to the extent the dates of birth in the remaining information pertain to individuals who have been de-identified, we find the privacy rights of these individuals have been sufficiently protected and the dates of birth belonging to these individuals may not be withheld. Accordingly, the district attorney’s office must withhold the information we have indicated, other than the pseudonyms of victims, and all living, identifiable public citizens’ dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Nevertheless, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern, and the district attorney’s office may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

We note some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body’s receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or official who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body’s receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Therefore, to the extent the employee whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district attorney’s office must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent

---

<sup>2</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision No. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

the employee did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the district attorney's office may not withhold the information under section 552.117(a)(1).

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the district attorney's office must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent any of the information at issue is the subject of a signed expunction order, the district attorney's office must withhold any such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with article 55.03 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. The district attorney's office must withhold the information we have indicated, other than the pseudonyms of victims, and all living, identifiable public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the employee whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district attorney's office must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The district attorney's office must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The district attorney's office must release the remaining information.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at [http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Kieran Hillis  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KH/sb

Ref: ID# 661606

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)